

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_118632
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Concept of Explainable AI and Developing Information Governance Standards for Enhancing Trust and Transparency in Handling Customer Data
Type of the Article	Literature Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, This research delves into how Explainable AI (XAI) models and robust information governance standards can bolster trust, transparency, and ethical utilization of customer data. Employing a mixed-methods approach, the study intertwines a thorough literature review with a survey encompassing 342 participants from diverse industries.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable, concise and depicts the importance of the review.</p> <p>3. Abstract is below 200 words and uniquely placed in categorization of the paper and significance that it delves into. Opens by acknowledging the ongoing discussions around Explainable AI, its analysis quantitative/qualitative way also explains the ethical considerations.</p> <p>4. Yes the paper addresses major sections Introduction, Literature review, methodologies, analysis, Statistical discriminant validity, Conclusion, recommendation and Discussion.</p> <p>5. Manuscript is scientifically correct and highlights the crucial importance of educating users to build trust and enable well-informed decision-making concerning interactions with AI.</p> <p>6. References are way too many manytimes it eludes to the less inclusion of original thoughts the author might want to add more original thoughts that using lot of citations to prove the point the point, It is imperative that at least the methodologies utilized should impose the thoughts from author and opinions that add a unique element of research thoughtness.</p> <p>In order to meet the research goals and assess the proposed hypotheses, this study utilized a mixed-methods strategy, incorporating qualitative and quantitative analyses. The qualitative aspect entailed a thorough examination of academic literature and industry reports sourced from reputable databases such as Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, and the ACM Digital Library. Researchers should emphasize their own thoughts at the same time and use cases that they think would be ideal for the study in real world to an extent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is as expected by most of journals no grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priyal Borole
Department, University & Country	United States